Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge CASE NUMBER			7. Darrah	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
		02 (2 4641	DATE	9/12/2002		
	CASE TITLE		BANK ON	E, N.A. vs. ROCHE	LLE EVERLY		
моз	ΓΙΟΝ:	[In the following box (a of the motion being pro		the motion, e.g., plaintiff, lefer	ndant, 3rd party plaintiff, and	d (b) state briefly the i	
DOC	CKET ENTRY:			V 12-12-1-1-1-1			
(1)	·	motion of Luca listin	or in "Motion" how a	hava l		<u> </u>	
		Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]					
(2) (3)		Brief in support of motion due					
(4)		Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due Ruling/Hearing on set for at					
(5)		Ruling/Hearing on set for at Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at					
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at					
(7)		Trial[set for/re-set for] on at					
(8)		[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at					
(9)	☐ This	This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] □ FRCP4(m) □ Local Rule 41.1 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).					
(10)	-	· ·	_	d. Enter Memorandi ismissed with prejuc	-	order. The sec	
(11)	■ [For	further detail see orde	er attached to the ori	ginal minute order.]	,		
	,	advised in open court.				Document Number	
No notices required. Notices mailed by judge's staff. Notified counsel by telephone.		dan's stoff		•	number of notices		
			SE	P 13.3000	,		
1	-	Docketing to mail notices.		ارا فراد اراد است.	. Asserted	1 7 /	
	Mail AO 450 form.		17!	The same of the sa	docketing deputy initials	U	
	Copy to judge/magis	trate judge.					
	.	courtroom			date mailed notice		
	LG	deputy's initials			1		
	LG	deputy's initials	I	ne received in Clerk's Office	mailing deputy initials	·	
			_ central	Citik 5 Cirice	0 1 3	<u> </u>	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

BANK ONE, N.A.,)
Plaintiff,))) No. 02 C 4641
v.)
ROCHELLE EVERLY, MAURICE F. CODY,) Judge John W. Darrah
PACIFIC COAST INVESTMENT CO., UNITED)
STATES OF AMEREICA, et al.,	<u> </u>
Defendants.	
MEMORANDUM OPINION	NAND ORDER

Plaintiff, Bank One, filed a Second Amended Complaint To Foreclose Mortgage ("Complaint") in the Circuit Court of Cook County against multiple defendants, including the United States of America ("United States"). The United States removed the Second Amended Complaint to this Court and filed the presently pending motion to dismiss. Bank One did not file a response to the motion to dismiss.

In reviewing a motion to dismiss, the court reviews all facts alleged in the complaint and any reasonable inferences drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. See Marshall-Mosby v. Corporate Receivables, Inc., 205 F.3d 323, 326 (7th Cir. 2000). Dismissal is only warranted if the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of its claims that would entitle it to relief. See Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

Bank One filed a complaint to foreclose its mortgage against the real property commonly known as 6806 South Constance Avenue (the "Constance Property"). In May 2002, Bank One filed a Second Amended Complaint. Maurice F. Cody ("Cody") was made a party to terminate his unspecified interest in the Constance Property. Bank One joined the United States to terminate its interest, which the complaint describes as "United States of America, by virtue of a

4

Lis Pendens recorded 4/18/01 as Document No. 0010316853, U.S. against Maurice Cody, Case 01 CR 261."

As to the criminal case referred to in the Complaint, on March 20, 2001, the United States filed its indictment against Cody. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 982 and as a result of violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956 and 1957, the indictment sought forfeiture of the Constance Property.

The United States moves to dismiss the Complaint, arguing that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(k)(2).

Section 853(k)(2) provides:

Except as provided in subsection (n)², no party claiming an interest in property subject to forfeiture under this section may—

(1) ***

(2) commence an action at law or equity against the United States concerning the validity of his alleged interest in the property subsequent to the filing of an indictment or information alleging that the property is subject to forfeiture under this section.

21 U.S.C. § 853(k)(2).

In the instant case, Bank One commenced its foreclosure action against the United States subsequent to the United States' filing the indictment that alleged the Constance Property was subject to forfeiture. Based on the plain language of Section 853(k)(2), Bank One cannot bring its civil action against the United States. See Roberts v. United States, 141 F.3d 1468, 1470 (11th Cir. 1998) (dismissing civil action pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 853(k)(2) because alleged property was subject to criminal forfeiture).

¹ On a motion to dismiss, the court may take judicial notice of court documents which are a matter of public record. *Doherty v. City of Chicago*, 75 F.3d 318, 324 n.4 (7th Cir. 1996).

²Subsection (n) allows a third party to challenge a final order of forfeiture entered under Section 853. See 21 U.S.C. § 853(n).

Based on the above, the United States' motion to dismiss is granted. The Second Amended Complaint to Foreclose Mortgage is dismissed with prejudice.

Dated: Ag Jeter 12, 2002

YOHN W. DARRAH

United States District Judge